ons; and with a framing so built as to cause an equal pressure in the vessel from this 300 tons in small surface. It must be ballasted also, so as to bring it as low down as possible with safety. One or both (main and fore, or mizen) masts must be raised to admit the column, so as to place it amid-ships a little diagonally. The vessel must take out from England her framework and timbers, &c., moulded for the restoration of the parts cut down, whether it be the stern or the stem, as may, on consideration, be thought best.

A cargo of timber (besides the frame for bed and rebuilding) must be taken out, with jacks, hydraulic presses, some of Rogers's anchors to fix in the sand, wooden and iron levers and crowbars, spades and shovels, strong blocks, pullies, tackles, hawsers, and cordage, because much power may be required that cannot be anticipated; and four or six of the largest masts, as they would be costly there; one or two handy forges, with a quantity of metal, and four iron cylinders for rollers, in case of need: an Italian truck (or more), such as may be seen in the Great Exhibition, might be useful: several ship-building carpenters, and a practical ship-builder, and working engineer from a railroad or the Britannia-bridge workmen, with a smith and mason, must also be sent out. No doubt the Pacha would lend workmen, or such could be procured: many have worked both in our own and in the French service who now reside at Alexandria.

If No. 2 is followed, either the vessel must be designed at home, and sent out in frame and plank, whether wood or iron, with all requisites (to do this would require chartering either the whole or some part of a merchant vessel), or a steam-tug, of not more power than requisite, to wait there, and bring the lighter home. The vessel having no masts would materially ease the operation of getting in and properly stowing the obelisk. The vessel of iron to be made air-tight, if possible, or have all spare space filled with India-rubber, or gutta percha, or soldered tin tubes.

Should it be thought that this vessel should in part be navigated, a mode of fixing small masts, without stepping on the keel, might be copied or imitated from the mode adopted in the Chinese junk, now in the river.

Should No. 3 be preferred, everything required by No. 2 will also be required, with trenching tools.

Should No. 4 be thought best, possibly some vessel either fit at present, or readily made so, if not built for the purpose, would be required. But I have seen a large lighter with screw propeller in the Thames, which, though not long enough, appears to me to offer a fair model for the vessel required.

Under any circumstances (except that of building under the monument) the vessel will require a complement of easily moved ballast, equal, or more than equal, to the presumed weight of the column to be carried—to be thrown out as the obelisk is admitted.

In the case of either a timber-built or iron-built lighter to be towed, or an iron steamer; I would suggest a very large extent of air-tight chambers or caisons, to be of service in case of any untoward accident. Iron seems the material most fitting for such purpose: indeed, when the vessel was battened down with her load, having air-tight cases or India rubber tubes within, to as large an extent as possible, to be useful in case of water getting in, she might have also a covering, or two or three or more air-tight tubes or square cases along the deck, or one running along on each gunwale, or even two, so as not to care how much she rolled, or was washed over.

As to the expenses of these various modes, I have not pretended to go into any close detail of them, but I think that altogether it would be done within twelve months at the farthest, instead of four years; and though the entire expense of bringing the Luxor Monument to Paris has not been made public (so far as known), I am persuaded that on the whole it would be accomplished for nearly one-fourth the money that has been stated on the authority of St. Vereniac St. Maur, Captain of the Luxor, at 28,000*l.* besides the cost of building the vessel, making on the aggregate 35,000*l.* or 40,000*l.*

The following must be taken simply as

ROUGH ESTIMATES OF THE COST OF EACH OF THESE PLANS.

No. 1.

Cost of a ship of 300 tons, colonial built, but strong and buoyant, say	£2,800
Framing and materials for rebuilding when the column is on board	800
Cutting down and rebuilding for the voyage home	600
Masts and timber, and materials and tools, crabs, presses, &c. &c., to assist in work to be done at Alexandria	800
Cost of getting the ship there and back	1,800
Extra skilled labour: hands to assist in all the varied operations	700
Work to be done in making the pier and moving the column	1,600
	£8,900
Ten per cent. for sundries	900
	£9,800

No. 2.

Making pier and moving column as before	£1,600
Moulding and framing a vessel, 400 tons	2,400
Chartering to take out the same	1,500
Putting together there	800
The towing home by the chartered vessel	1,500
Skilled labour sent out	700
	£8,500
Ten per cent., say	900
	£9,400

No. 3.

Making canal, basin, &c. would be substituted for the inclined plane at the same expense, say £9,400

No. 4.

If a screw steamer could be found applicable, no doubt the whole affair could be managed for *less*; but if to be built for the purpose, the expense would probably exceed that of No. 1. Add to this estimate, salary and expenses of a superintending engineer, &c. from one thousand to twelve hundred pounds.

All these chance estimates are with the understanding that the column be delivered in the ship at any one of her Majesty's dock-yards; the vessel to be rebuilt after the column is taken out, or amount paid for the same as may be agreed upon.

ADDITIONAL MEMORANDA.

White pine or Baltic fir is the best material for the ship; a displacement of not less than 1,000 cubic feet required; as flat a bottom as consistent with safe sea navigation.

The entire obelisk must be strongly cased with thick plank strengthened with oak to preserve the polish and sculpture. It must have equal strain on raising it, by bands on various parts, to avoid breaking it. All the obelisks at Rome upset by the barbarians were broken by the fall.

The north port is bothering, the Channel difficult for a long vessel, which should not draw above 6 feet 6 inches or 7 feet of water. A steamer should always be in attendance.

NATHANIEL GOULD.

THE SEVEN PERIODS OF ENGLISH ARCHITECTURE.*

THE importance and interest of the subject, the discussion of which has lately occupied a place in your pages, renders it doubly to be wished that the advocates on either side would enter upon it with the calmness suited to a scientific inquiry, and with that absence of personal feeling which can alone insure a satisfactory issue. One would have imagined that between any two men who take an interest in such a subject, there would have been too much in common to have left room for personal animosities, and that if a friendly joust should now and then take place, the recognition of a gentle antagonist through the bars of his visor would rather lead to a loving embrace than a deadly conflict. I cannot but deeply regret the tone assumed by Mr. Sharpe, as to whether he was right or not as to the personality of his opponent: his guess was one which should have induced the respect due to an old and zealous fellow labourer, rather than the bitter and causeless sarcasms which have disturbed the subsequent controversy. It seems, however, that the introduction of a new system of nomenclature has a natural tendency to produce a bilious excitability, as has been exemplified in an attack made by the *Ecclesiologist* some time back upon Mr. Poole, who had had the temerity to doubt the eligibility of their system. It shows, however, satisfactorily that we are all really in earnest, and is, perhaps, to be hailed as a wholesome symptom of vitality.

My object in troubling you is not to become myself a combatant,—from what I have seen I should tremble at the thought,—but simply to point out the desirableness of clearing the controversy of extraneous matter, and of keeping it to the real questions at issue. The question is not whether Mr. Sharpe or "F. S. A." is the more accurate in his chronology, nor is it whether Mr. Sharpe has chosen the best dates as the boundaries of his "periods;" much less is it whether examples of his *styles* are to be found overtaking those boundaries: such a question as this is simply absurd, unless such extreme cases may be found as to stultify his divisions altogether: nor is it, again, a question as to the merits of his nomenclature; but it is simply, whether the architecture of England, from the Conquest to the Renaissance, is more properly divided into *four* periods or into *six*. If we were to keep ourselves to this question we should rid the subject of much of its perplexity.

Now I think both of your leading combatants have allowed themselves to be far too much excited about so simple a question. I think there is far too much flourish of trumpets on one side, as if a great discovery had been made; and most needless dismay on the other, as if the very foundations of our edifice were threatened. I confess myself unable to distinguish any great discovery on the one hand, or any great innovation on the other. I believe we all, for many years past, have practically adopted, and that we must of necessity in practice use, a system of division closely resembling, and often in words as well as in fact coinciding with, Mr. Sharpe's "Periods."

First, we all call the architecture from the Conquest a long way on into the 12th century, "Norman." Then, ask any one what is the style of St. Cross (the choir and transepts), or of Eyland or Glastonbury, and he will, ten to one, answer "Transition:" then, again, we often call Salisbury and Whitby specimens of the "Lancet" style; and what do we call the style of Lincoln Presbytery and York Chapter-house but "Geometrical?" Thus far our vernacular, conversational nomenclature is identical with that adopted by Mr. Sharpe, and the two remaining divisions we only differ upon so far as names go, calling one "Flowing," *vice* "Curvilinear;" the other "Perpendicular" instead of "Rectilinear." Where, then, do we practically differ? Simply in this,—that Mr. Sharpe, in some cases, gives the dignity of *separate styles* or "periods" to divisions which we generally consider merely as *sub*-styles.

I confess myself doubtful as to which view of the subject is the right one, and I especially doubt whether a confessedly Transitional period should be classed on equal terms with periods of perfect developement, and I am disposed to think that on that point "F. S. A." has said much to add to one's doubtfulness. Were I subdividing for myself, I should have placed this division later, so as to agree rather with what the *Ecclesiologist* would call the "Early first Pointed," than to give it only the later specimens of Norman, more or less tinged with "Pointed" anticipations. The important part, however, of the question at issue does not lie here, but in the erection of the two great divisions of the "Decorated" or "Middle Pointed" into styles instead of sub-styles: on this the whole interest of the controversy is in reality concentrated.

In all systems this division is clearly acknowledged. In one it is marked as that between the early and late "Decorated;" in another as between early and late "Middle Pointed;" in a third, as between early and late "Complete Gothic;" in common parlance, as between "Geometrical" and "Flowing"—*Decorated* or *Middle Pointed* being understood.

Mr. Freeman, however, has given it a pro-

* See p. 468, *ante*.

For a comprehensive guide on PDF Compression and OCR visit ThePaperlessOffice.org